A measure of genuine multipartite quantum discord for arbitrary N partite quantum state.

Zhi-Hao Ma[*]
Department of Mathematics, Shanghai Jiaotong University, Shanghai, 200240, P.R.China

Zhi-Hua Chen
Department of Science, Zhijiang college, Zhejiang University of technology, Hangzhou, 310024, P.R.China

(Dated: August 24, 2011)

We propose a measure of genuine multipartite quantum discord for arbitrary N partite quantum state.

PACS numbers: 03.67.-a, 75.10.Pq, 03.67.Mn

arXiv:1108.4174v2 [quant-ph] 23 Aug 2011

Entanglement, is a distinctive feature of quantum mechanics [1, 2], and has been found numerous applications in quantum information processing tasks [3].The problem of detect whether a quantum state is entanglement or not is widely studied, However, entanglement does not necessarily exhaust all quantum correlations present in a state. Beyond entanglement, quantum discord is a suitable measure of quantum correlation.The total correlations between two quantum systems A and B are quantified by the quantum mutual information

$$\mathcal{I}(\rho_{AB}) = S(\rho_A) + S(\rho_B) - S(\rho_{AB}) \tag{1}$$

where $S(\rho) = -\mathrm{Tr}(\rho\log_2\rho)$ is the Von Neumann entropy and $\rho_{A(B)} = \mathrm{Tr}_{B(A)}(\rho_{AB})$.

On the other hand, the classical part of correlations is defined as the maximum information about one subsystem that can be obtained by performing a measurement on the other system. Given a set of projective (von Neumann) measurements described by a complete set of orthogonal projectors $\{\hat\Pi_B^j\} = \{|b_j\rangle\langle b_j|\}$ and locally performed only on system B, which satisfying that $\hat\Pi_B^j \geqslant 0$, $\sum_k \hat\Pi_B^j = I$, I is the identity operator, then the information about A is the difference between the initial entropy of A and the conditional entropy, that is $\mathcal{I}(\rho_{AB}|\{\hat\Pi_B^j\}) = S(\rho_A) - \sum_j p_j S(\rho_j)$, where $\rho_j = (I\otimes\hat\Pi_B^j)\rho(I\otimes\hat\Pi_B^j)/\mathrm{Tr}[(I\otimes\hat\Pi_B^j)\rho(I\otimes\hat\Pi_B^j)]$, p_j is the probability of the measurement outcome j and I is the identity operator for subsystem A. Classical correlations are thus quantified by $\mathcal{Q}(\rho_{AB}) = \sup_{\{\hat\Pi_B^j\}}\mathcal{I}(\rho_{AB}|\{\hat\Pi_B^j\})$ and the quantum discord is then defined by

$$\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{B}}(\rho_{AB}) = \mathcal{I}(\rho_{AB}) - \mathcal{Q}(\rho_{AB}), \tag{2}$$

which is zero only for states with classical correlations and nonzero for states with quantum correlations. The nonclassical correlations captured by the quantum discord may be present even in separable states.[5]

Relative entropy and symmetric quantum discord. – The quantum relative entropy is a measure of distinguishability between two arbitrary density operators $\hat\rho$ and $\hat\sigma$, which is defined as $S(\hat\rho\parallel\hat\sigma) = \mathrm{Tr}(\hat\rho\log_2\hat\rho - \hat\rho\log_2\hat\sigma)$ [16]. We can express the quantum mutual information $I(\hat\rho_{AB})$ as the relative entropy between $\hat\rho_{AB}$ and the product state $\hat\rho_A\otimes\hat\rho_B$, i.e.

$$I(\hat\rho_{AB}) = S(\hat\rho_{AB}\parallel\hat\rho_A\otimes\hat\rho_B). \tag{3}$$

In order to express the measurement-induced quantum mutual information $J(\hat\rho_{AB})$ in terms of relative entropy, we need to consider a non-selective von Neumann measurement on part B of $\hat\rho_{AB}$, which yields $\Phi_B(\hat\rho_{AB}) = \sum_j\left(\hat{1}_A\otimes\hat\Pi_B^j\right)\hat\rho_{AB}\left(\hat{1}_A\otimes\hat\Pi_B^j\right) = \sum_j p_j\hat\rho_{A|j}\otimes|b_j\rangle\langle b_j|$. Moreover, tracing over the variables of the subsystem A, we obtain $\Phi_B(\hat\rho_B) = \Phi_B(\mathrm{Tr}_A\hat\rho_{AB}) = \sum_j p_j|b_j\rangle\langle b_j|$, where we have used that $\mathrm{Tr}_A(\hat\rho_{A|j}) = 1$. Then, by expressing the entropies $S(\Phi_B(\hat\rho_{AB}))$ and $S(\Phi_B(\hat\rho_B))$ as $S(\Phi_B(\hat\rho_{AB})) = H(\mathbf{p}) + \sum_j p_j S\left(\hat\rho_{A|j}\right)$ and $S(\Phi_B(\hat\rho_B)) = H(\mathbf{p})$, with $H(\mathbf{p})$ denoting the Shannon entropy $H(\mathbf{p}) = -\sum_j p_j\log_2(p_j)$, we can rewrite $J(\hat\rho_{AB})$ as

$$J(\hat\rho_{AB}) = S(\Phi_B(\hat\rho_{AB})\parallel\hat\rho_A\otimes\Phi_B(\hat\rho_B)). \tag{4}$$

Therefore, the quantum discord can be rewriten in terms of a difference of relative entropies: $\overline{\mathcal{D}}(\hat\rho_{AB}) = S(\hat\rho_{AB}\parallel\hat\rho_A\otimes\hat\rho_B) - S(\Phi_B(\hat\rho_{AB})\parallel\hat\rho_A\otimes\Phi_B(\hat\rho_B))$, with minimization taken over $\{\hat\Pi_B^j\}$ to remove the measurement-basis dependence. It is possible then to obtain a natural symmetric extension $\mathcal{D}(\hat\rho_{AB})$ for the quantum discord $\overline{\mathcal{D}}(\hat\rho_{AB})$.

Indeed, performing measurements over subsystem A, we define A-discord as:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{A}}(\hat\rho_{AB}) = \min_{\{\hat\Pi_A^k\otimes I\}} &\left[S\left(\hat\rho_{AB}\parallel\Phi_{AB}^A(\hat\rho_{AB})\right)\right. \\ &\left.-S(\hat\rho_A\parallel\Phi_A(\hat\rho_A)) - S\left(\hat\rho_B\parallel\Phi_B^I(\hat\rho_B)\right)\right].\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

where the operator Φ_{AB}^A is given by

$$\Phi_{AB}^A(\hat\rho_{AB}) = \sum_k\left(\hat\Pi_A^k\otimes I\right)\hat\rho_{AB}\left(\hat\Pi_A^k\otimes I\right). \tag{6}$$

and the operator Φ_A is given by

$$\Phi_A(\hat\rho_A) = \sum_k\left(\hat\Pi_A^k\right)\hat\rho_A\left(\hat\Pi_A^k\right). \tag{7}$$

and the operator Φ_B^I is in fact the identity operator

$$\Phi_B^I\left(\hat{\rho}_B\right)=\hat{\rho}_B \tag{8}$$

performing measurements over subsystem B, we define B-discord as:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{B}}\left(\hat{\rho}_{AB}\right)=&\min_{\{I\otimes\hat{\Pi}_B^k\}}\left[S\left(\hat{\rho}_{AB}\parallel\Phi_{AB}^B\left(\hat{\rho}_{AB}\right)\right)\right.\\&\left.-S\left(\hat{\rho}_A\parallel\Phi_A^I\left(\hat{\rho}_A\right)\right)-S\left(\hat{\rho}_B\parallel\Phi_B\left(\hat{\rho}_B\right)\right)\right].\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

where the operator Φ_{AB}^B is given by

$$\Phi_{AB}^B\left(\hat{\rho}_{AB}\right)=\sum_k\left(I\otimes\hat{\Pi}_B^k\right)\hat{\rho}_{AB}\left(I\otimes\hat{\Pi}_B^k\right). \tag{10}$$

and the operator Φ_B is given by

$$\Phi_B\left(\hat{\rho}_B\right)=\sum_k\left(\hat{\Pi}_B^k\right)\hat{\rho}_B\left(\hat{\Pi}_B^k\right). \tag{11}$$

and the operator Φ_A^I is in fact the identity operator

$$\Phi_A^I\left(\hat{\rho}_A\right)=\hat{\rho}_A \tag{12}$$

Then, the symmetric discord is defined as

$$\mathcal{D}(\hat{\rho}_{AB})=\min[\mathcal{D}_A(\hat{\rho}_{AB}),\mathcal{D}_B(\hat{\rho}_{AB})] \tag{13}$$

The aim of this work is to give a measure of genuine multipartite quantum discord for arbitrary N partite state. We will extend quantum discord as given by Eq. (13) to multipartite systems.

Recall that an N-partite pure state $|\psi\rangle\in\mathcal{H}_1\otimes\mathcal{H}_2\otimes\cdots\mathcal{H}_N$ is called biseparable if there is a bipartition $j_1j_2\cdots j_k|j_{k+1}\cdots j_N$ such that

$$|\psi\rangle=|\psi_1\rangle_{j_1j_2\cdots j_k}|\psi_2\rangle_{j_{k+1}\cdots j_N}, \tag{14}$$

where $\{j_1,j_2,\cdots j_k|j_{k+1},\cdots j_N\}$ is any partition of $\{1,2,\cdots,N\}$, e.g., $\{13|24\}$ is a partition of $\{1,2,3,4\}$.

Let γ be any subset $\{j_1j_2\cdots j_k\}$ of $\{1,2,...,N\}$, corresponding to a partition $j_1j_2\cdots j_k|j_{k+1}\cdots j_N$, e.g., for three qubits state, $\gamma=1$ corresponding to the partition $A|BC$, and corresponding to the reduced density matrix ρ_A, while if $\gamma=23$, then it corresponding to the reduced density matrix ρ_{BC}.

Definition. For an arbitrary N partite state $\hat{\rho}_{1\cdots N}$, the genuine multipartite quantum discord $\mathcal{D}\left(\hat{\rho}_{1\cdots N}\right)$ is defined as follows:

(1). First, let ρ be an n partite state, and γ be any subset $\{j_1j_2\cdots j_k\}$ of $\{1,2,...,N\}$, corresponding to a partition $j_1j_2\cdots j_k|j_{k+1}\cdots j_N$, e.g., for three qubits state, $\gamma=1$ corresponding to the partition $A|BC$, and corresponding to the reduced density matrix ρ_A, and γ' is defined as the complemental set of γ(that is, the set union of γ and γ' is the total set $\{1,2,...,N\}$, i.e.,for three qubits state, if $\gamma=1$, then $\gamma'=23$), then define the γ-discord as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{D}_\gamma\left(\hat{\rho}_{1,2,\ldots,N}\right)=&\min_{\{I_{\gamma'}\otimes\hat{\Pi}_\gamma^k\}}\left[S\left(\hat{\rho}_{1,2,\ldots,N}\parallel\Phi_{1,2,\ldots,N}^\gamma\left(\hat{\rho}_{1,2,\ldots,N}\right)\right)\right.\\&\left.-S\left(\hat{\rho}_\gamma\parallel\Phi_\gamma\left(\hat{\rho}_\gamma\right)\right)\right].\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

where the operator $\Phi_{1,2,\ldots,N}^\gamma$ is given by

$$\Phi_{1,2,\ldots,N}^\gamma\left(\hat{\rho}_{1,2,\ldots,N}\right)=\sum_k\left(I_{\gamma'}\otimes\hat{\Pi}_\gamma^k\right)\hat{\rho}_{1,2,\ldots,N}\left(I_{\gamma'}\otimes\hat{\Pi}_\gamma^k\right). \tag{16}$$

Here $I_{\gamma'}$ is the identity operator for subsystem γ', and the operator Φ_γ is given by

$$\Phi_\gamma\left(\hat{\rho}_\gamma\right)=\sum_k\left(\hat{\Pi}_\gamma^k\right)\hat{\rho}_\gamma\left(\hat{\Pi}_\gamma^k\right). \tag{17}$$

(2). then define the genuine multipartite quantum discord as the minimal of all γ-discord:

$$\mathcal{D}\left(\hat{\rho}_{1,2,\ldots,N}\right)=\min_\gamma\mathcal{D}_\gamma\left(\hat{\rho}_{1,2,\ldots,N}\right) \tag{18}$$

where the min run over all partition γ.

Take three partite quantum state ρ_{123} as example.

For $\gamma=1$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{D}_1\left(\hat{\rho}_{1,2,3}\right)=&\min_{\{I_{23}\otimes\hat{\Pi}_1^k\}}\left[S\left(\hat{\rho}_{1,2,3}\parallel\Phi_{1,2,3}^1\left(\hat{\rho}_{1,2,3}\right)\right)\right.\\&\left.-S\left(\hat{\rho}_1\parallel\Phi_1\left(\hat{\rho}_1\right)\right)\right].\end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

where the operator $\Phi_{1,2,3}^1$ is given by

$$\Phi_{1,2,3}^1\left(\hat{\rho}_{1,2,3}\right)=\sum_k\left(\hat{\Pi}_1^k\otimes I_{23}\right)\hat{\rho}_{1,2,3}\left(\hat{\Pi}_1^k\otimes I_{23}\right). \tag{20}$$

and the operator Φ_1 is given by

$$\Phi_1\left(\hat{\rho}_1\right)=\sum_k\left(\hat{\Pi}_1^k\right)\hat{\rho}_1\left(\hat{\Pi}_1^k\right). \tag{21}$$

For $\gamma=2$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{D}_2\left(\hat{\rho}_{1,2,3}\right)=&\min_{\{I_{13}\otimes\hat{\Pi}_2^k\}}\left[S\left(\hat{\rho}_{1,2,3}\parallel\Phi_{1,2,3}^2\left(\hat{\rho}_{1,2,3}\right)\right)\right.\\&\left.-S\left(\hat{\rho}_2\parallel\Phi_2\left(\hat{\rho}_2\right)\right)\right].\end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

where the operator $\Phi_{1,2,3}^2$ is given by

$$\Phi_{1,2,3}^2\left(\hat{\rho}_{1,2,3}\right)=\sum_k\left(I_1\otimes\hat{\Pi}_2^k\otimes I_3\right)\hat{\rho}_{1,2,3}\left(I_1\otimes\hat{\Pi}_2^k\otimes I_3\right). \tag{23}$$

and the operator Φ_2 is given by

$$\Phi_2\left(\hat{\rho}_2\right)=\sum_k\left(\hat{\Pi}_2^k\right)\hat{\rho}_2\left(\hat{\Pi}_2^k\right). \tag{24}$$

For $\gamma=12$,

$$\mathcal{D}_{12}\left(\hat{\rho}_{1,2,3}\right)=\min_{\{I_3\otimes\hat{\Pi}_{12}^{k}\}}\left[S\left(\hat{\rho}_{1,2,3}\parallel\Phi_{1,2,3}^{12}\left(\hat{\rho}_{1,2,3}\right)\right)\right.\\ \left.-S\left(\hat{\rho}_{12}\parallel\Phi_{12}\left(\hat{\rho}_{12}\right)\right)\right]. \quad (25)$$

where the operator $\Phi_{1,2,3}^{12}$ is given by

$$\Phi_{1,2,3}^{12}\left(\hat{\rho}_{1,2,3}\right)=\sum_{k}\left(\hat{\Pi}_{12}^{k}\otimes I_3\right)\hat{\rho}_{1,2,3}\left(\hat{\Pi}_{12}^{k}\otimes I_3\right). \quad (26)$$

and the operator Φ_{12} is given by

$$\Phi_{12}\left(\hat{\rho}_{12}\right)=\sum_{k}\left(\hat{\Pi}_{12}^{k}\right)\hat{\rho}_{12}\left(\hat{\Pi}_{12}^{k}\right). \quad (27)$$

Similarly, we can get the case of $\gamma=3,\gamma=13,\gamma=23$, and get $\mathcal{D}\left(\hat{\rho}_{1,2,3}\right)=\min_{\gamma}\mathcal{D}_{\gamma}\left(\hat{\rho}_{1,2,3}\right)$, where γ run over the six sets $1,2,3,12,13,23$.

Therefore, a genuine multipartite classical state can be defined by the following: we say that a multipartite quantum state is genuine multipartite classical, if there exists a partition γ, such that $\hat{\rho}_{1\cdots N}=\Phi_{1,2,\ldots,N}^{\gamma}\left(\hat{\rho}_{1\cdots N}\right)$, which means that classical states are not disturbed by a suitable local measurements. Indeed, this definition of a classical state implies that $\hat{\rho}_{\gamma}=\Phi_{\gamma}\left(\hat{\rho}_{\gamma}\right)$, which means $\mathcal{D}\left(\hat{\rho}_{1\cdots N}\right)=0$.

Theorem For an N partite quantum state $\hat{\rho}_{A_1\cdots A_N}$ on Hilbert space $H_1\otimes H_2\cdots H_N$, The genuine multipartite quantum discord $\mathcal{D}\left(\hat{\rho}_{A_1\cdots A_N}\right)$ is non-negative, i.e., $\mathcal{D}\left(\hat{\rho}_{A_1\cdots A_N}\right)\geqslant 0$.

Proof. To prove that $\mathcal{D}\left(\hat{\rho}_{A_1\cdots A_N}\right)\geqslant 0$,we need to prove that, for any γ, the γ-discord is non-negative, i.e., $\mathcal{D}_{\gamma}\left(\hat{\rho}_{A_1\cdots A_N}\right)\geqslant 0$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $\gamma=1$, which corresponding to the reduced density matrix $\hat{\rho}_{A_1}$. Define the POVM as follows: define $\Phi\left(\hat{\rho}_{A_1\cdots A_N}\right)=\sum_k\hat{\Pi}_k\,\hat{\rho}_{A_1\cdots A_N}\,\hat{\Pi}_k$, with $\hat{\Pi}_k=\hat{\Pi}_{A_1}^{j_1}\otimes\cdots\otimes\hat{\Pi}_{A_N}^{j_N}$ and k denoting the index string $(j_1\cdots j_N)$, with j_1 an arbitrary integer, $j_2=j_3=\cdots j_N=1$, and define $\Phi_1\left(\hat{\rho}_{A_1}\right)=\sum_{j_1}\hat{\Pi}_{A_1}^{j_1}\,\hat{\rho}_{A_1}\,\hat{\Pi}_{A_1}^{j_1}$ and $\Phi_i\left(\hat{\rho}_{A_i}\right)=\hat{\rho}_{A_i}, i=2,3\cdots N$.

We associate with each subsystem A_j an ancilla system B_j. Therefore, we will define a composite density operator $\hat{\rho}'_{A_1\cdots A_N;B_1\cdots B_N}$ such that

$$\hat{\rho}'_{A_1\cdots A_N;B_1\cdots B_N}=\sum_{k}\sum_{k'}\hat{\Pi}_k\,\hat{\rho}_{A_1\cdots A_N}\,\hat{\Pi}_{k'}\otimes\hat{\Lambda}_{kk'}, \quad (28)$$

where $\hat{\Lambda}_{kk'}=|B_{j_1}\cdots B_{j_N}\rangle\langle B_{j'_1}\cdots B_{j'_N}|$, with k and k' denoting the index strings $(j_1\cdots j_N)$ and $(j'_1\cdots j'_N)$,with j_1,j'_1 arbitrary integers, $j_2=j_3=\cdots j_N=j'_1=j'_2=\cdots=j'_N=1$, respectively. From the monotonicity of the relative entropy under partial trace [21], for any positive operators $\hat{\sigma}_{12}$ and $\hat{\gamma}_{12}$ such that $\mathrm{Tr}\left(\hat{\sigma}_{12}\right)=\mathrm{Tr}\left(\hat{\gamma}_{12}\right)$, we have that $S\left(\hat{\sigma}_{12}\|\hat{\gamma}_{12}\right)\geqslant S\left(\hat{\sigma}_{1}\|\hat{\gamma}_{1}\right)$, where $\hat{\sigma}_1=\mathrm{Tr}_2\left(\hat{\sigma}_{12}\right)$ and $\hat{\gamma}_1=\mathrm{Tr}_2\left(\hat{\gamma}_{12}\right)$. Then $S\left(\hat{\sigma}_{123\ldots N}\|\hat{\gamma}_{123\ldots N}\right)\geqslant\ldots\geqslant S\left(\hat{\sigma}_{123}\|\hat{\gamma}_{123}\right)\geqslant S\left(\hat{\sigma}_{12}\|\hat{\gamma}_{12}\right)\geqslant S\left(\hat{\sigma}_{1}\|\hat{\gamma}_{1}\right)$. By taking $\hat{\rho}'_{A_1\cdots A_N;B_1\cdots B_N}$ as $\hat{\sigma}$ and $\hat{\rho}_{A_1;B_1}\otimes\hat{\rho}'_{A_2;B_2}\otimes\ldots\otimes\hat{\rho}'_{A_N;B_N}$ as $\hat{\gamma}$, we obtain

$$S\left(\hat{\rho}'_{A_1\cdots A_N;B_1\cdots B_N}\|\hat{\rho}'_{A_1;B_1}\otimes\hat{\rho}'_{A_2;B_2}\otimes\ldots\otimes\hat{\rho}'_{A_N;B_N}\right)\\ \geqslant S\left(\hat{\rho}'_{A_1\cdots A_N}\|\hat{\rho}'_{A_1}\otimes\ldots\otimes\hat{\rho}'_{A_N}\right), \quad (29)$$

which therefore implies that $\sum_{j=1}^{N}S\left(\hat{\rho}'_{A_j;B_j}\right)-S\left(\hat{\rho}'_{A_1\cdots A_N;B_1\cdots B_N}\right)\geqslant\sum_{j=1}^{N}S\left(\hat{\rho}'_{A_j}\right)-S\left(\hat{\rho}'_{A_1\cdots A_N}\right)$. Moreover, from Eq. (28), it follows the relations: $S\left(\hat{\rho}'_{A_1\cdots A_N;B_1\cdots B_N}\right)=S\left(\hat{\rho}_{A_1\cdots A_N}\right)$, $S\left(\hat{\rho}'_{A_1\cdots A_N}\right)=S\left(\Phi\left(\hat{\rho}_{A_1\cdots A_N}\right)\right)$, $S\left(\hat{\rho}'_{A_j;B_j}\right)=S\left(\hat{\rho}_{A_j}\right)$ $(\forall j)$, and $S\left(\hat{\rho}'_{A_j}\right)=S\left(\Phi_j\left(\hat{\rho}_{A_j}\right)\right)$ $(\forall j)$. Then, inequality (29) becomes $\sum_{j=1}^{N}S\left(\hat{\rho}_{A_j}\right)-S\left(\hat{\rho}_{A_1\cdots A_N}\right)\geqslant\sum_{j=1}^{N}S\left(\Phi_j\left(\hat{\rho}_{A_j}\right)\right)-S\left(\Phi\left(\hat{\rho}_{A_1\cdots A_N}\right)\right)$. By rewriting this inequality in terms of the relative entropy, we obtain $S\left(\hat{\rho}_{A_1\cdots A_N}\|\Phi\left(\hat{\rho}_{A_1\cdots A_N}\right)\right)-\sum_{j=1}^{N}S\left(\hat{\rho}_{A_j}\|\Phi_j\left(\hat{\rho}_{A_j}\right)\right)\geqslant 0$. so, we proved that $\mathcal{D}_{\gamma}\left(\hat{\rho}_{A_1\cdots A_N}\right)\geqslant 0$. For other γ, the proof remain the same, then we get that $\mathcal{D}\left(\hat{\rho}_{A_1\cdots A_N}\right)\geqslant 0$.

■

---

[*] Email:ma9452316@gmail.com

[1] Horodecki R., Horodecki P., Horodecki M., Horodecki K., Rev. Mod. Phys. **81**, 865(2009).
[2] Gühne O., Toth G., Phys. Rep. **474**, 1(2009).
[3] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*, Cambridge University Press, 2000.
[4] L. Amico *et al.*, Rev. Mod. Phys. **80**, 517 (2008).
[5] H. Ollivier and W. H. Zurek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 017901 (2001).
[6] R. Dillenschneider, Phys, Rev. B **78**, 224413 (2008); M. S. Sarandy, Phys. Rev. A **80**, 022108 (2009); T. Werlang *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 095702 (2010).
[7] J. Maziero *et al.*, Phys. Rev. A **82**, 012106 (2010); Y.-X. Chen and S.-W. Li, Phys. Rev. A **81**, 032120 (2010); B. Tomasello *et al.*, e-print arXiv:1012.4270 (2010).
[8] A. Shabani and D. A. Lidar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 100402 (2009); J. Maziero *et al.*, Phys. Rev. A **80**, 044102 (2009); J. Maziero *et al.*, Phys. Rev. A **81**, 022116 (2010); A. Ferraro *et al.*, Phys. Rev. A **81**, 052318 (2010); L. Mazzola, J. Piilo, and S. Maniscalco , Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 200401 (2010).
[9] A. Datta, A. Shaji, and C. M. Caves, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 050502 (2008).
[10] D. P. DiVincenzo *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 067902 (2004); A. Datta and S. Gharibian, Phys. Rev. A **79**, 042325 (2009).
[11] K. Modi and V. Vedral, e-print arXiv:1104.1520 (2011).
[12] I. Chakrabarty, P. Agrawal, and A. K. Pati, e-print arXiv:1006.5784 (2010).
[13] M. Okrasa and Z. Walczak, e-print arXiv:1101.6057 (2011).
[14] K. Modi *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 080501 (2010).
[15] L. Henderson and V. Vedral, J. Phys. A **34**, 6899 (2001).
[16] V. Vedral, Rev. Mod. Phys. **74**, 197 (2002).

[17] S. Luo and S. Fu, Phys. Rev. A **82**, 034302 (2010).
[18] S. Luo, Phys. Rev. A **77**, 022301 (2008).
[19] J. Maziero, L. C. Celeri, and R. M. Serra, e-print arXiv:1004.2082 (2010).
[20] R. Auccaise *et al.*, e-print arXiv:1104.1596 (2011).
[21] M. B. Ruskai, J. Math. Phys. **43**, 4358 (2002).
[22] R. F. Werner, Phys. Rev. A **40**, 4277 (1989).
[23] S. Luo, Phys. Rev. A **77**, 042303 (2008).
[24] J. Ashkin and E. Teller, Phys. Rev. **64**, 178 (1943).
[25] M. Kohmoto, M. den Nijs, and L. P. Kadanoff, Phys. Rev. B **24**, 5229 (1981).
[26] C. Gils, J. Stat. Mech. **P07019** (2009); M. S. Grønsleth *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **79**, 094506 (2009).
[27] S.-J. Gu, G.-S. Tian, and H.-Q. Lin, Phys. Rev. A **68**, 042330 (2003).
[28] Y. Chen *et al.*, New J. Phys. **8**, 97 (2006).
[29] C. C. Rulli and M. S. Sarandy, Phys. Rev. A **81**, 032334 (2010).
[30] F. F. Fanchini *et al.*, e-print arXiv:1006.2460 (2010).
[31] B. Bellomo, G. Compagno, R. Lo Franco, A. Ridolfo, S. Savasta,arXiv:1106.4496.
[32] C. C. Rulli, M. S. Sarandy,arXiv:1105.2548.

arXiv:1108.4174v2 [quant-ph] 23 Aug 2011

witness to detect the genuine multipartite semiquantum for arbitrary N partite quantum state.

Zhi-Hao Ma*
Department of Mathematics, Shanghai Jiaotong University, Shanghai, 200240, P.R.China

Zhi-Hua Chen
Department of Science, Zhijiang college, Zhejiang University of technology, Hangzhou, 310024, P.R.China

(Dated: August 24, 2011)

witness to detect the genuine multipartite semiquantum for arbitrary N partite quantum state.

PACS numbers: 03.67.-a, 75.10.Pq, 03.67.Mn

Entanglement, is a distinctive feature of quantum mechanics [1, 2], and has been found numerous applications in quantum information processing tasks [3].The problem of detect whether a quantum state is entanglement or not is widely studied, However, entanglement does not necessarily exhaust all quantum correlations present in a state. Beyond entanglement, quantum discord is a suitable measure of quantum correlation.The total correlations between two quantum systems A and B are quantified by the quantum mutual information

$$\mathcal{I}(\rho_{AB}) = S(\rho_A) + S(\rho_B) - S(\rho_{AB}) \tag{1}$$

where $S(\rho) = -\mathrm{Tr}(\rho\log_2\rho)$ is the Von Neumann entropy and $\rho_{A(B)} = \mathrm{Tr}_{B(A)}(\rho_{AB})$.

On the other hand, the classical part of correlations is defined as the maximum information about one subsystem that can be obtained by performing a measurement on the other system. Given a set of projective (von Neumann) measurements described by a complete set of orthogonal projectors $\{\hat\Pi_B^j\} = \{|b_j\rangle\langle b_j|\}$ and locally performed only on system B, which satisfying that $\hat\Pi_B^j \geqslant 0$, $\sum_k \hat\Pi_B^j = I$, I is the identity operator, then the information about A is the difference between the initial entropy of A and the conditional entropy, that is $\mathcal{I}(\rho_{AB}|\{\hat\Pi_B^j\}) = S(\rho_A) - \sum_j p_j S(\rho_j)$, where $\rho_j = (I\otimes\hat\Pi_B^j)\rho(I\otimes\hat\Pi_B^j)/\mathrm{Tr}[(I\otimes\hat\Pi_B^j)\rho(I\otimes\hat\Pi_B^j)]$, p_j is the probability of the measurement outcome j and I is the identity operator for subsystem A. Classical correlations are thus quantified by $\mathcal{Q}(\rho_{AB}) = \sup_{\{\hat\Pi_B^j\}}\mathcal{I}(\rho_{AB}|\{\hat\Pi_B^j\})$ and the quantum discord is then defined by

$$\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{B}}(\rho_{AB}) = \mathcal{I}(\rho_{AB}) - \mathcal{Q}(\rho_{AB}), \tag{2}$$

which is zero only for states with classical correlations and nonzero for states with quantum correlations. The nonclassical correlations captured by the quantum discord may be present even in separable states.[5]

Relative entropy and symmetric quantum discord. – The quantum relative entropy is a measure of distinguishability between two arbitrary density operators $\hat\rho$ and $\hat\sigma$, which is defined as $S(\hat\rho\,\|\,\hat\sigma) = \mathrm{Tr}(\hat\rho\log_2\hat\rho - \hat\rho\log_2\hat\sigma)$ [16]. We can express the quantum mutual information $I(\hat\rho_{AB})$ as the relative entropy between $\hat\rho_{AB}$ and the product state $\hat\rho_A\otimes\hat\rho_B$, i.e.

$$I(\hat\rho_{AB}) = S(\hat\rho_{AB}\,\|\,\hat\rho_A\otimes\hat\rho_B). \tag{3}$$

In order to express the measurement-induced quantum mutual information $J(\hat\rho_{AB})$ in terms of relative entropy, we need to consider a non-selective von Neumann measurement on part B of $\hat\rho_{AB}$, which yields $\Phi_B(\hat\rho_{AB}) = \sum_j\left(\hat 1_A\otimes\hat\Pi_B^j\right)\hat\rho_{AB}\left(\hat 1_A\otimes\hat\Pi_B^j\right) = \sum_j p_j\hat\rho_{A|j}\otimes|b_j\rangle\langle b_j|$. Moreover, tracing over the variables of the subsystem A, we obtain $\Phi_B(\hat\rho_B) = \Phi_B(\mathrm{Tr}_A\,\hat\rho_{AB}) = \sum_j p_j|b_j\rangle\langle b_j|$, where we have used that $\mathrm{Tr}_A(\hat\rho_{A|j}) = 1$. Then, by expressing the entropies $S(\Phi_B(\hat\rho_{AB}))$ and $S(\Phi_B(\hat\rho_B))$ as $S(\Phi_B(\hat\rho_{AB})) = H(\mathbf{p}) + \sum_j p_j S\left(\hat\rho_{A|j}\right)$ and $S(\Phi_B(\hat\rho_B)) = H(\mathbf{p})$, with $H(\mathbf{p})$ denoting the Shannon entropy $H(\mathbf{p}) = -\sum_j p_j\log_2(p_j)$, we can rewrite $J(\hat\rho_{AB})$ as

$$J(\hat\rho_{AB}) = S(\Phi_B(\hat\rho_{AB})\,\|\,\hat\rho_A\otimes\Phi_B(\hat\rho_B)). \tag{4}$$

Therefore, the quantum discord can be rewriten in terms of a difference of relative entropies: $\overline{\mathcal{D}}(\hat\rho_{AB}) = S(\hat\rho_{AB}\,\|\,\hat\rho_A\otimes\hat\rho_B) - S(\Phi_B(\hat\rho_{AB})\,\|\,\hat\rho_A\otimes\Phi_B(\hat\rho_B))$), with minimization taken over $\{\hat\Pi_B^j\}$ to remove the measurement-basis dependence. It is possible then to obtain a natural symmetric extension $\mathcal{D}(\hat\rho_{AB})$ for the quantum discord $\overline{\mathcal{D}}(\hat\rho_{AB})$.

Indeed, performing measurements over subsystem A, we define A-discord as:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{A}}(\hat\rho_{AB}) = \min_{\{\hat\Pi_A^k\otimes I\}}&\left[S\left(\hat\rho_{AB}\,\|\,\Phi_{AB}^A(\hat\rho_{AB})\right)\right.\\ &\left.-S(\hat\rho_A\,\|\,\Phi_A(\hat\rho_A)) - S\left(\hat\rho_B\,\|\,\Phi_B^I(\hat\rho_B)\right)\right].\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

where the operator Φ_{AB}^A is given by

$$\Phi_{AB}^A(\hat\rho_{AB}) = \sum_k\left(\hat\Pi_A^k\otimes I\right)\hat\rho_{AB}\left(\hat\Pi_A^k\otimes I\right). \tag{6}$$

and the operator Φ_A is given by

$$\Phi_A(\hat\rho_A) = \sum_k\left(\hat\Pi_A^k\right)\hat\rho_A\left(\hat\Pi_A^k\right). \tag{7}$$

and the operator Φ_B^I is in fact the identity operator

$$\Phi_B^I\left(\hat{\rho}_B\right) = \hat{\rho}_B \tag{8}$$

performing measurements over subsystem B, we define B-discord as:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{B}}\left(\hat{\rho}_{AB}\right) = \min_{\{I\otimes\hat{\Pi}_B^k\}} &\left[S\left(\hat{\rho}_{AB} \parallel \Phi_{AB}^B\left(\hat{\rho}_{AB}\right)\right)\right.\\ &\left.-S\left(\hat{\rho}_A \parallel \Phi_A^I\left(\hat{\rho}_A\right)\right) - S\left(\hat{\rho}_B \parallel \Phi_B\left(\hat{\rho}_B\right)\right)\right].\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

where the operator Φ_{AB}^B is given by

$$\Phi_{AB}^B\left(\hat{\rho}_{AB}\right) = \sum_k \left(I\otimes\hat{\Pi}_B^k\right)\hat{\rho}_{AB}\left(I\otimes\hat{\Pi}_B^k\right). \tag{10}$$

and the operator Φ_B is given by

$$\Phi_B\left(\hat{\rho}_B\right) = \sum_k \left(\hat{\Pi}_B^k\right)\hat{\rho}_B\left(\hat{\Pi}_B^k\right). \tag{11}$$

and the operator Φ_A^I is in fact the identity operator

$$\Phi_A^I\left(\hat{\rho}_A\right) = \hat{\rho}_A \tag{12}$$

Then, the symmetric discord is defined as

$$\mathcal{D}(\hat{\rho}_{AB}) = \min[\mathcal{D}_A(\hat{\rho}_{AB}), \mathcal{D}_B(\hat{\rho}_{AB})] \tag{13}$$

The aim of this work is to give a measure of genuine multipartite quantum discord for arbitrary N partite state. We will extend quantum discord as given by Eq. (13) to multipartite systems.

Recall that an N-partite pure state $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2 \otimes \cdots \mathcal{H}_N$ is called biseparable if there is a bipartition $j_1 j_2 \cdots j_k | j_{k+1} \cdots j_N$ such that

$$|\psi\rangle = |\psi_1\rangle_{j_1 j_2 \cdots j_k} |\psi_2\rangle_{j_{k+1}\cdots j_N}, \tag{14}$$

where $\{j_1, j_2, \cdots j_k | j_{k+1}, \cdots j_N\}$ is any partition of $\{1, 2, \cdots, N\}$, e.g., $\{13|24\}$ is a partition of $\{1,2,3,4\}$.

Let γ be any subset $\{j_1 j_2 \cdots j_k\}$ of $\{1, 2, ..., N\}$, corresponding to a partition $j_1 j_2 \cdots j_k | j_{k+1} \cdots j_N$, e.g., for three qubits state, $\gamma = 1$ corresponding to the partition $A|BC$, and corresponding to the reduced density matrix ρ_A, while if $\gamma = 23$, then it corresponding to the reduced density matrix ρ_{BC}.

Definition 1. For an arbitrary N partite state $\hat{\rho}_{1\cdots N}$, the genuine multipartite quantum discord $\mathcal{D}\left(\hat{\rho}_{1\cdots N}\right)$ is defined as follows:

(1). First, let ρ be an n partite state, and γ be any subset $\{j_1 j_2 \cdots j_k\}$ of $\{1, 2, ..., N\}$, corresponding to a partition $j_1 j_2 \cdots j_k | j_{k+1} \cdots j_N$, e.g., for three qubits state, $\gamma = 1$ corresponding to the partition $A|BC$, and corresponding to the reduced density matrix ρ_A, and γ' is defined as the complemental set of γ(that is, the set union of γ and γ' is the total set $\{1, 2, ..., N\}$, i.e.,for three qubits state, if $\gamma = 1$, then $\gamma' = 23$), then define the γ-discord as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{D}_\gamma\left(\hat{\rho}_{1,2,...,N}\right) = \min_{\{I_{\gamma'}\otimes\hat{\Pi}_\gamma^k\}} &\left[S\left(\hat{\rho}_{1,2,...,N} \parallel \Phi_{1,2,...,N}^\gamma\left(\hat{\rho}_{1,2,...,N}\right)\right)\right.\\ &\left.-S\left(\hat{\rho}_\gamma \parallel \Phi_\gamma\left(\hat{\rho}_\gamma\right)\right)\right].\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

where the operator $\Phi_{1,2,...,N}^\gamma$ is given by

$$\Phi_{1,2,...,N}^\gamma\left(\hat{\rho}_{1,2,...,N}\right) = \sum_k \left(I_{\gamma'}\otimes\hat{\Pi}_\gamma^k\right)\hat{\rho}_{1,2,...,N}\left(I_{\gamma'}\otimes\hat{\Pi}_\gamma^k\right). \tag{16}$$

Here $I_{\gamma'}$ is the identity operator for subsystem γ', and the operator Φ_γ is given by

$$\Phi_\gamma\left(\hat{\rho}_\gamma\right) = \sum_k \left(\hat{\Pi}_\gamma^k\right)\hat{\rho}_\gamma\left(\hat{\Pi}_\gamma^k\right). \tag{17}$$

(2). then define the genuine multipartite quantum discord as the minimal of all γ-discord:

$$\mathcal{D}\left(\hat{\rho}_{1,2,...,N}\right) = \min_\gamma \mathcal{D}_\gamma\left(\hat{\rho}_{1,2,...,N}\right) \tag{18}$$

where the min run over all partition γ.

Take three partite quantum state ρ_{123} as example.

For $\gamma = 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{D}_1\left(\hat{\rho}_{1,2,3}\right) = \min_{\{I_{23}\otimes\hat{\Pi}_1^k\}} &\left[S\left(\hat{\rho}_{1,2,3} \parallel \Phi_{1,2,3}^1\left(\hat{\rho}_{1,2,3}\right)\right)\right.\\ &\left.-S\left(\hat{\rho}_1 \parallel \Phi_1\left(\hat{\rho}_1\right)\right)\right].\end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

where the operator $\Phi_{1,2,3}^1$ is given by

$$\Phi_{1,2,3}^1\left(\hat{\rho}_{1,2,3}\right) = \sum_k \left(\hat{\Pi}_1^k\otimes I_{23}\right)\hat{\rho}_{1,2,3}\left(\hat{\Pi}_1^k\otimes I_{23}\right). \tag{20}$$

and the operator Φ_1 is given by

$$\Phi_1\left(\hat{\rho}_1\right) = \sum_k \left(\hat{\Pi}_1^k\right)\hat{\rho}_1\left(\hat{\Pi}_1^k\right). \tag{21}$$

For $\gamma = 2$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{D}_2\left(\hat{\rho}_{1,2,3}\right) = \min_{\{I_{13}\otimes\hat{\Pi}_2^k\}} &\left[S\left(\hat{\rho}_{1,2,3} \parallel \Phi_{1,2,3}^2\left(\hat{\rho}_{1,2,3}\right)\right)\right.\\ &\left.-S\left(\hat{\rho}_2 \parallel \Phi_2\left(\hat{\rho}_2\right)\right)\right].\end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

where the operator $\Phi_{1,2,3}^2$ is given by

$$\Phi_{1,2,3}^2\left(\hat{\rho}_{1,2,3}\right) = \sum_k \left(I_1\otimes\hat{\Pi}_2^k\otimes I_3\right)\hat{\rho}_{1,2,3}\left(I_1\otimes\hat{\Pi}_2^k\otimes I_3\right). \tag{23}$$

and the operator Φ_2 is given by

$$\Phi_2\left(\hat{\rho}_2\right) = \sum_k \left(\hat{\Pi}_2^k\right)\hat{\rho}_2\left(\hat{\Pi}_2^k\right). \tag{24}$$

For $\gamma = 12$,

$$\mathcal{D}_{12}\left(\hat{\rho}_{1,2,3}\right)=\min_{\{I_3\otimes\hat{\Pi}_{12}^{k}\}}\left[S\left(\hat{\rho}_{1,2,3}\parallel\Phi_{1,2,3}^{12}\left(\hat{\rho}_{1,2,3}\right)\right)\right.$$
$$\left.-S\left(\hat{\rho}_{12}\parallel\Phi_{12}\left(\hat{\rho}_{12}\right)\right)\right]. \qquad (25)$$

where the operator $\Phi_{1,2,3}^{12}$ is given by

$$\Phi_{1,2,3}^{12}\left(\hat{\rho}_{1,2,3}\right)=\sum_{k}\left(\hat{\Pi}_{12}^{k}\otimes I_3\right)\hat{\rho}_{1,2,3}\left(\hat{\Pi}_{12}^{k}\otimes I_3\right). \qquad (26)$$

and the operator Φ_{12} is given by

$$\Phi_{12}\left(\hat{\rho}_{12}\right)=\sum_{k}\left(\hat{\Pi}_{12}^{k}\right)\hat{\rho}_{12}\left(\hat{\Pi}_{12}^{k}\right). \qquad (27)$$

Similarly, we can get the case of $\gamma=3,\gamma=13,\gamma=23$, and get $\mathcal{D}\left(\hat{\rho}_{1,2,3}\right)=\min_{\gamma}\mathcal{D}_{\gamma}\left(\hat{\rho}_{1,2,3}\right)$, where γ run over the six sets $1,2,3,12,13,23$.

Theorem 1. For an N partite quantum state $\hat{\rho}_{A_1\cdots A_N}$ on Hilbert space $H_1\otimes H_2\cdots H_N$, The genuine multipartite quantum discord $\mathcal{D}\left(\hat{\rho}_{A_1\cdots A_N}\right)$ is non-negative, i.e., $\mathcal{D}\left(\hat{\rho}_{A_1\cdots A_N}\right)\geqslant 0$.

Proof. To prove that $\mathcal{D}\left(\hat{\rho}_{A_1\cdots A_N}\right)\geqslant 0$,we need to prove that, for any γ, the γ-discord is non-negative, i.e., $\mathcal{D}_{\gamma}\left(\hat{\rho}_{A_1\cdots A_N}\right)\geqslant 0$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $\gamma=1$, which corresponding to the reduced density matrix $\hat{\rho}_{A_1}$. Define the POVM as follows: define $\Phi\left(\hat{\rho}_{A_1\cdots A_N}\right)=\sum_k\hat{\Pi}_k\,\hat{\rho}_{A_1\cdots A_N}\,\hat{\Pi}_k$, with $\hat{\Pi}_k=\hat{\Pi}_{A_1}^{j_1}\otimes\cdots\otimes\hat{\Pi}_{A_N}^{j_N}$ and k denoting the index string $(j_1\cdots j_N)$, with j_1 an arbitrary integer, $j_2=j_3=\cdots j_N=1$, and define $\Phi_1\left(\hat{\rho}_{A_1}\right)=\sum_{j_1}\hat{\Pi}_{A_1}^{j_1}\,\hat{\rho}_{A_1}\,\hat{\Pi}_{A_1}^{j_1}$ and $\Phi_i\left(\hat{\rho}_{A_i}\right)=\hat{\rho}_{A_i}, i=2,3\cdots N$.

We associate with each subsystem A_j an ancilla system B_j. Therefore, we will define a composite density operator $\hat{\rho}'_{A_1\cdots A_N;B_1\cdots B_N}$ such that

$$\hat{\rho}'_{A_1\cdots A_N;B_1\cdots B_N}=\sum_{k}\sum_{k'}\hat{\Pi}_k\,\hat{\rho}_{A_1\cdots A_N}\,\hat{\Pi}_{k'}\otimes\hat{\Lambda}_{kk'}, \qquad (28)$$

where $\hat{\Lambda}_{kk'}=|B_{j_1}\cdots B_{j_N}\rangle\langle B_{j'_1}\cdots B_{j'_N}|$, with k and k' denoting the index strings $(j_1\cdots j_N)$ and $(j'_1\cdots j'_N)$,with j_1,j'_1 arbitrary integers, $j_2=j_3=\cdots j_N=j'_1=j'_2=\cdots=j'_N=1$, respectively. From the monotonicity of the relative entropy under partial trace [21], for any positive operators $\hat{\sigma}_{12}$ and $\hat{\gamma}_{12}$ such that $\mathrm{Tr}\left(\hat{\sigma}_{12}\right)=\mathrm{Tr}\left(\hat{\gamma}_{12}\right)$, we have that $S\left(\hat{\sigma}_{12}\|\hat{\gamma}_{12}\right)\geqslant S\left(\hat{\sigma}_1\|\hat{\gamma}_1\right)$, where $\hat{\sigma}_1=\mathrm{Tr}_2\left(\hat{\sigma}_{12}\right)$ and $\hat{\gamma}_1=\mathrm{Tr}_2\left(\hat{\gamma}_{12}\right)$. Then $S\left(\hat{\sigma}_{123\ldots N}\|\hat{\gamma}_{123\ldots N}\right)\geqslant\ldots\geqslant S\left(\hat{\sigma}_{123}\|\hat{\gamma}_{123}\right)\geqslant S\left(\hat{\sigma}_{12}\|\hat{\gamma}_{12}\right)\geqslant S\left(\hat{\sigma}_1\|\hat{\gamma}_1\right)$. By taking $\hat{\rho}'_{A_1\cdots A_N;B_1\cdots B_N}$ as $\hat{\sigma}$ and $\hat{\rho}_{A_1;B_1}\otimes\hat{\rho}'_{A_2;B_2}\otimes\ldots\otimes\hat{\rho}'_{A_N;B_N}$ as $\hat{\gamma}$, we obtain

$$S\left(\hat{\rho}'_{A_1\cdots A_N;B_1\cdots B_N}\|\hat{\rho}'_{A_1;B_1}\otimes\hat{\rho}'_{A_2;B_2}\otimes\ldots\otimes\hat{\rho}'_{A_N;B_N}\right)$$
$$\geqslant S\left(\hat{\rho}'_{A_1\cdots A_N}\|\hat{\rho}'_{A_1}\otimes\ldots\otimes\hat{\rho}'_{A_N}\right), \qquad (29)$$

which therefore implies that $\sum_{j=1}^{N}S\left(\hat{\rho}'_{A_j;B_j}\right)-S\left(\hat{\rho}'_{A_1\cdots A_N;B_1\cdots B_N}\right)\geqslant\sum_{j=1}^{N}S\left(\hat{\rho}'_{A_j}\right)-S\left(\hat{\rho}'_{A_1\cdots A_N}\right)$. Moreover, from Eq. (28), it follows the relations: $S\left(\hat{\rho}'_{A_1\cdots A_N;B_1\cdots B_N}\right)=S\left(\hat{\rho}_{A_1\cdots A_N}\right)$, $S\left(\hat{\rho}'_{A_1\cdots A_N}\right)=S\left(\Phi\left(\hat{\rho}_{A_1\cdots A_N}\right)\right)$, $S\left(\hat{\rho}'_{A_j;B_j}\right)=S\left(\hat{\rho}_{A_j}\right)$ $(\forall j)$, and $S\left(\hat{\rho}'_{A_j}\right)=S\left(\Phi_j\left(\hat{\rho}_{A_j}\right)\right)$ $(\forall j)$. Then, inequality (29) becomes $\sum_{j=1}^{N}S\left(\hat{\rho}_{A_j}\right)-S\left(\hat{\rho}_{A_1\cdots A_N}\right)\geqslant\sum_{j=1}^{N}S\left(\Phi_j\left(\hat{\rho}_{A_j}\right)\right)-S\left(\Phi\left(\hat{\rho}_{A_1\cdots A_N}\right)\right)$. By rewriting this inequality in terms of the relative entropy, we obtain $S\left(\hat{\rho}_{A_1\cdots A_N}\|\Phi\left(\hat{\rho}_{A_1\cdots A_N}\right)\right)-\sum_{j=1}^{N}S\left(\hat{\rho}_{A_j}\|\Phi_j\left(\hat{\rho}_{A_j}\right)\right)\geqslant 0$. so, we proved that $\mathcal{D}_{\gamma}\left(\hat{\rho}_{A_1\cdots A_N}\right)\geqslant 0$. For other γ, the proof remain the same, then we get that $\mathcal{D}\left(\hat{\rho}_{A_1\cdots A_N}\right)\geqslant 0$.

■

Definition 2. a multipartite state is said to be **genuine multipartite semiquantum (GMS for short)**, if there exists a partition γ, such that $\hat{\rho}_{1\cdots N}=\Phi_{1,2,\ldots,N}^{\gamma}\left(\hat{\rho}_{1\cdots N}\right)$, where **the super operator $\Phi_{1,2,\ldots,N}^{\gamma}$ is defined as Eq. (16)**, which means that semiquantum states are not disturbed by a suitable local measurements, (see Ref [23]for bipartite case). Indeed, this definition of a semiquantum state implies that $\hat{\rho}_{\gamma}=\Phi_{\gamma}\left(\hat{\rho}_{\gamma}\right)$, which means $\mathcal{D}\left(\hat{\rho}_{1\cdots N}\right)=0$.

Remark. Note that, the genuine multipartite semiquantum state may contain bipartite quantum discord. To see this, Define $\rho_{ABC}=\rho_{AB}\otimes\rho_C$,with ρ_{AB} be the maximal entanglement Bell state, and $\rho_C=|\Phi\rangle\langle\Phi|$, $|\Phi\rangle=(1,0)^T$. The 3-partite state ρ_{ABC} is a genuine multipartite semiquantum state, but it contain 2-partite quantum discord.

Similar to the proof of Ref [23], we get the following conditions for a N partite state $\rho_{1,2,\ldots,N}$ to be genuine multipartite semiquantum, the following are equivalent:

(1). $\rho_{1,2,\ldots,N}$ is genuine multipartite semiquantum.

(2). there exists a partition $\gamma|\gamma'$(e.g. for three partite state, $A|BC$ is such a partition), such that the state do not changed after the action of the superoperator $\Phi_{1,2,\ldots,N}^{\gamma}$, which is given by $\Phi_{1,2,\ldots,N}^{\gamma}\left(\rho_{1,2,\ldots,N}\right)=\sum_k\left(I_{\gamma'}\otimes\hat{\Pi}_{\gamma}^{k}\right)\rho_{1,2,\ldots,N}\left(I_{\gamma'}\otimes\hat{\Pi}_{\gamma}^{k}\right)$ ..

(3). $\rho_{1,2,\ldots,N}$ commutes with each $I_{\gamma'}\otimes\hat{\Pi}_{\gamma}^{k}$.

(4).$\rho_{1,2,\ldots,N}$ has the representation as:

$$\rho_{1,2,\ldots,N}=\sum_{k}p_k\rho_{\gamma'}^{k}\otimes\hat{\Pi}_{\gamma}^{k}$$

, with p_k a probability distribution, and $\rho_{\gamma'}^{k}$ are local states on subsystem γ', e.g., $\gamma'=23$.

In [33], the authors get a witness to detect the semiquantum of bipartite state, as follows:

For a given bipartite state ϱ_{AB}, a polynomial LU invariant of degree k is given by $\mathrm{Tr}(U^AU^B\varrho_{AB}^{\otimes k})$, where $U^{A(B)}$ is some permutation operator acting on k copies of subsystem $A(B)$ [**?**]. In what follows we shall consider only $k=4$ copies of the state and label them with numbers from 1 to 4. As examples the permutation operator

U^B may be taken as $V_{12}^B V_{34}^B$ or $V_{13}^B V_{24}^B$, where

$$V_{ij}^B = \sum_{n_1,n_2=0}^{d_B-1} |n_1, n_2\rangle\langle n_2, n_1|_{ij} = \sum_{\mu=0}^{d_B^2-1} G_\mu^{B_i} \otimes G_\mu^{B_j} \qquad (30)$$

is the swapping operator acting on two copies of qudit B labeled with $i, j = 1, 2, 3, 4$. Here we have introduced a complete set of local orthogonal observables [**?**] $\{G_\mu^B \mid \mu = 0, 1, 2, \ldots d_B^2 - 1\}$ satisfying $\mathrm{Tr}(G_\mu^B G_\nu^B) = \delta_{\mu\nu}$ for qudit B. The permutation operator U^A may be the cyclic permutation operator

$$X_A = \sum_{n_1,n_2,n_3,n_4=0}^{d_A-1} |n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4\rangle\langle n_2, n_3, n_4, n_1| \qquad (31)$$

acting on four copies of qudit A. It is obvious that $X_A = V_{12}^A V_{23}^A V_{34}^A$. Our main result is:

Lemma [33] A $d_A \times d_B$ bipartite state ϱ_{AB} has a vanishing quantum discord, i.e, $D_A(\varrho_{AB}) = 0$, if and only if $\mathrm{Tr}(W\varrho_{AB}^{\otimes 4}) = 0$ where

$$W = \frac{1}{2}(X_A + X_A^\dagger)(V_{13}^B V_{24}^B - V_{12}^B V_{34}^B). \qquad (32)$$

Now, we turn to our problem, we wish to get a witness to detect the semi-quantum of N partite state.

To do this, if we split the N partite state as a two partite state, that is, $\gamma|\gamma'$(e.g. for three partite state, $A|BC$ is such a partition), look γ as part A, γ' as part B, then we can get the following:

Theorem 2 Regard an N partite state $\rho_{1,2,\ldots,N}$ as a bipartite state $\varrho_{A^\gamma B^{\gamma'}}$, (with that look γ as part A, γ' as part B, so A and B only depend on γ, γ', and we use $A^\gamma, B^{\gamma'}$ to denote this), then $\rho_{1,2,\ldots,N}$ has a vanishing quantum discord, i.e, $D(\rho) = 0$, if and only if there exists a partition $\gamma|\gamma'$, such that $\mathrm{Tr}(W\varrho_{A^\gamma B^{\gamma'}}^{\otimes 4}) = 0$ where

$$W = \frac{1}{2}(X_{A^\gamma} + X_{A^\gamma}^\dagger)(V_{13}^{B^{\gamma'}} V_{24}^{B^{\gamma'}} - V_{12}^{B^{\gamma'}} V_{34}^{B^{\gamma'}}). \qquad (33)$$

So the witness can be find as: $\min_\gamma \mathrm{Tr}(W\varrho_{A^\gamma B^{\gamma'}}^{\otimes 4})$, where the minimal run over all possible partition γ.

---

* Email:ma9452316@gmail.com

[1] Horodecki R., Horodecki P., Horodecki M., Horodecki K., Rev. Mod. Phys. **81**, 865(2009).

[2] Gühne O., Toth G., Phys. Rep. **474**, 1(2009).

[3] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*, Cambridge University Press, 2000.

[4] L. Amico *et al.*, Rev. Mod. Phys. **80**, 517 (2008).

[5] H. Ollivier and W. H. Zurek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 017901 (2001).

[6] R. Dillenschneider, Phys, Rev. B **78**, 224413 (2008); M. S. Sarandy, Phys. Rev. A **80**, 022108 (2009); T. Werlang *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 095702 (2010).

[7] J. Maziero *et al.*, Phys. Rev. A **82**, 012106 (2010); Y.-X. Chen and S.-W. Li, Phys. Rev. A **81**, 032120 (2010); B. Tomasello *et al.*, e-print arXiv:1012.4270 (2010).

[8] A. Shabani and D. A. Lidar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 100402 (2009); J. Maziero *et al.*, Phys. Rev. A **80**, 044102 (2009); J. Maziero *et al.*, Phys. Rev. A **81**, 022116 (2010); A. Ferraro *et al.*, Phys. Rev. A **81**, 052318 (2010); L. Mazzola, J. Piilo, and S. Maniscalco , Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 200401 (2010).

[9] A. Datta, A. Shaji, and C. M. Caves, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 050502 (2008).

[10] D. P. DiVincenzo *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 067902 (2004); A. Datta and S. Gharibian, Phys. Rev. A **79**, 042325 (2009).

[11] K. Modi and V. Vedral, e-print arXiv:1104.1520 (2011).

[12] I. Chakrabarty, P. Agrawal, and A. K. Pati, e-print arXiv:1006.5784 (2010).

[13] M. Okrasa and Z. Walczak, e-print arXiv:1101.6057 (2011).

[14] K. Modi *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 080501 (2010).

[15] L. Henderson and V. Vedral, J. Phys. A **34**, 6899 (2001).

[16] V. Vedral, Rev. Mod. Phys. **74**, 197 (2002).

[17] S. Luo and S. Fu, Phys. Rev. A **82**, 034302 (2010).

[18] S. Luo, Phys. Rev. A **77**, 022301 (2008).

[19] J. Maziero, L. C. Celeri, and R. M. Serra, e-print arXiv:1004.2082 (2010).

[20] R. Auccaise *et al.*, e-print arXiv:1104.1596 (2011).

[21] M. B. Ruskai, J. Math. Phys. **43**, 4358 (2002).

[22] R. F. Werner, Phys. Rev. A **40**, 4277 (1989).

[23] S. Luo, Phys. Rev. A **77**, 042303 (2008).

[24] J. Ashkin and E. Teller, Phys. Rev. **64**, 178 (1943).

[25] M. Kohmoto, M. den Nijs, and L. P. Kadanoff, Phys. Rev. B **24**, 5229 (1981).

[26] C. Gils, J. Stat. Mech. **P07019** (2009); M. S. Grønsleth *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **79**, 094506 (2009).

[27] S.-J. Gu, G.-S. Tian, and H.-Q. Lin, Phys. Rev. A **68**, 042330 (2003).

[28] Y. Chen *et al.*, New J. Phys. **8**, 97 (2006).

[29] C. C. Rulli and M. S. Sarandy, Phys. Rev. A **81**, 032334 (2010).

[30] F. F. Fanchini *et al.*, e-print arXiv:1006.2460 (2010).

[31] B. Bellomo, G. Compagno, R. Lo Franco, A. Ridolfo, S. Savasta,arXiv:1106.4496.

[32] C. C. Rulli, M. S. Sarandy,arXiv:1105.2548.

[33] Sixia Yu, Chengjie Zhang, Qing Chen, C.H.Oh,arXiv:1102.4710.